

Application No.: 10/551,795  
Amendment Dated: October 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: July 25, 2007

MAT-8755US

**Amendments to the Drawings:**

The attached sheets of drawings include changes to Figs. 1 and 13. These sheets replace the original sheets.

**Remarks/Arguments:**

Claims 1-16 are pending and stand rejected.

By this amendment, claims 4 and 12 are amended, and claim 11 is cancelled without prejudice. No new matter is presented by the claim amendment.

**Drawing Objection**

In the Office Action, at item 4, the drawings are objected to because the unlabeled rectangular boxes shown in the drawings (Fig. 1 and Fig. 13) should be provided with descriptive text labels.

Replacement drawing sheets of Fig. 1 and Fig. 13 are submitted to overcome this objection.

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

**Rejection of Claims 1-12 and 14-16 under 35 USC § 102(b)**

In the Office Action, at item 7, claims 1-12 and 14-16 are rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by Kimura et al. (US Pat. Publication No. 2002/0133595, hereafter referred to as Kimura).

The rejection of claims 1-10 and 14-16 is respectfully traversed.

**Claim 1**

Claim 1 is directed to a home link setting method by a home gateway device having a home agent function for accommodating terminals including mobile terminals, and recites

a step of receiving network information for setting a home network through a communication interface connected to an Internet network;

a home link selecting step of selecting a home link from among links connecting to communication interfaces other than the communication interface which has received the network information.

That is, the home link setting method includes selecting a home link from among **links connecting to communication interfaces other than the communication interface (connected to the Internet network)**.

#### **Kimora Reference**

Kimora discloses a home network 100 that includes a home gateway 110 having a routing function that follows packets between routers and an access point (AP) 150 that is connected to home gateway 110. The home gateway 110 of Kimora is connected to ISP 200 (a server operated by an Internet Service Provider). The connection between home gateway 110 and ISP 200 is a communication interface corresponding to the communications interface connected to the Internet network recited in claim 1. Kimora further discloses a communication interface (i.e. a single communication interface between home gateway 110 and access point AP 150. Because home gateway 110 includes only a single communication interface for the home network the step of selecting a home link from **among links connecting to communications interfaces** other than the communications interface which has received the network information is not possible in Kimora.

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Kimora teaches "a home link selecting step of selecting a home link from among links connecting to communication interfaces other than the communication interface which has received the network information **(Location Management Table which is created base on a location registrant request message from mobile node see paragraph [0011])**," (emphasis in original).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's contention. The Location Management Table of Kimora does not correspond to the links connecting to communication interfaces other than the communication interface which has received the network information. Instead, the Location Management Table registers home addresses and care of address of each mobile node. These home addresses and care-of-addresses are not links connecting to communication interfaces. This is because, Kimora is silent about such links and, furthermore, the establishment of such links would occur in Kimora before any registration of, for example, care of addresses. Thus, the creation of the Location Management Table in Kimora does not disclose or

suggest the step of selecting a home link from among home links connecting to communication interfaces other than the communication interface which has received the network information.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 1 patentably distinguishes over Kimora for at least the above mentioned reasons.

#### **Claim 6**

Claim 6, which includes similar but not identical features to those of claim 1, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kimora for at least similar reasons to those of claim 1.

#### **Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 15-16**

Claims 2-5, 7-10 and 15-16, which include all of the limitations of claim 1 or claim 6, are submitted to patentably distinguish over Kimora for at least the same reasons as claim 1 or claim 6.

#### **Claim 12**

Reconsideration of the rejection of claim 12 is respectfully requested.

Claim 12 is directed to a mobile terminal, and recites "said mobile IP processing unit further transmits a response message in which the state of its mobile router processing is written."

In the Office Action, the Examiner contends that Kimora teaches that:

the mobile IP processing unit further transmits a response message in which the state of its mobile router processing is written (response [sic] to the agent advertisement message) 'Mobile node 160 sends this location registration request message in response to the agent advertisement message transmitted by agent advertisement transmission circuit 124' see ¶ [0011]), (emphasis in original).

Applicant respectfully disagrees. In Kimora, location registration request message is a message merely requesting the registration of a location and, in

particular, it does not include information about the state of the mobile router. More particularly, Kimora is silent regarding any information written in the location registration request message which provides the processing state of the mobile router. Instead, for example, at paragraph [0024], Kimora merely discloses, that the location registration request message includes the care of address of the mobile node.

Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 12 patentably distinguishes over Kimora.

**Claim 14**

Claim 14, which includes all the limitations of claim 12, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kimora for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

**Claim 11**

Claim 11 has been cancelled without prejudice. Accordingly, the rejection of claim 11 is now moot.

**Rejection of Claim 13 Under 35 USC § 103(a)**

In the Office Action, at item 23, claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kimora in view of Leung (US Pat. No. 6,466,964).

Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Claim 13, which includes all of the features of claim 12, is submitted to patentably distinguish over Kimora for at least the same reasons as claim 12.

The addition of Leung does not overcome the deficiencies of Kimora. This is because, Leung does not disclose or suggest transmission of a response messaging in which the state of its mobile router processing is written. Instead, Leung, which is used by the Examiner to teach the determination of whether the destination address is on the same network as the node so that the network address of the gateway need not be acquired is silent regarding messages containing the processing state of a mobile router.

Application No.: 10/551,795  
Amendment Dated: October 18, 2007  
Reply to Office Action of: July 25, 2007

MAT-8755US


Accordingly, it is submitted that claim 13 patentably distinguishes over Kimora in view of Leung for the above-mentioned reasons.

**Conclusion**

In view of the claim amendments and remarks, Applicant submits the application is in condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Ratner Prestia

  
Lawrence E. Ashery, Reg. No. 34,515  
Attorney for Applicant

LEA/EB/dmw/fp

Attachments: Figures 1 and 13 (2 sheets)

Dated: October 18, 2007

P.O. Box 980  
Valley Forge, PA 19482  
(610) 407-0700

EB/205288